DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 174 127 HE 011 469

AUTHOR Hims, R. Sue
TITLE Facilitating Pervasive Planning: Multi-Level Institutional Planning. AIR Forum 1979 Paper.
PUB DATE May 79
NOTE 48p.; Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (19th, San Diego, California, May 13-17, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Objectives; Centralization; *College Administration; *College Planning; Decentralization; Higher Education; *Institutional Evaluation; *Institutional Research; *Organizational Climate; Political Influences
IDENTIFIERS *AIR Forum 1979; *Planning Methods; Stanford University CA; University of Michigan; University of Minnesota; University of Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

Ways in which planning can be enhanced across organizational levels within higher education institutions are outlined, and examples of institutional planning are analyzed from centralized/decentralized perspectives. Generalizations about planning are drawn with particular attention to ways in which effective human planning behavior can be facilitated. The analysis is based on the following premises: planning must become a pervasive organizational activity; planning is not something apart from management; and planning needs to be understood and implemented as a sociopolitical activity as well as a technical activity. The following key behaviors are identified: (1) join and remain; (2) perform role dependably; (3) provide effort above the minimum; (4) exhibit adaptive, innovative behavior; and (5) perform cooperatively. The planning histories of the University of Michigan, the University of Minnesota, the University of Pennsylvania, and Stanford University are briefly considered. Three papers on planning by T. Michael Elliott, Loretta Glaze Elliott, and Thomas W. West and outlines of planning strategies and processes are appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED174127

THE ASSOCIATION FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

This paper was presented at the Nineteenth Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research held at the Town and Country Inn in San Diego, California, May 13-17, 1979. This paper was reviewed by the AIR Forum Publications Committee and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of Forum papers.

Mary Corcoran
University of Minnesota
(Editor, AIR Forum Publications)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AIR

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 011 469

FACILITATING PERVASIVE PLANNING:

MULTI-LEVEL INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING

R. Sue Mims
Office of Academic Planning and Analysis
University of Michigan
6074 Administration Building
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

Presented at : Association For Institutional Research Forum
San Diego, California
May 13-17, 1979

FACILITATING PERVASIVE PLANNING: MULTI-LEVEL INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING

R. Sue Mims

As higher education prepares to enter the 80's more emphasis is being placed upon planning as a means of addressing problems such as enrollment decline and financial stringency. Many institutions have introduced new planning efforts. However, in many instances implementation has been more difficult and more time-consuming than expected and results have often been disappointing. The promotion of planning as a panacea is being replaced by a more practical view of the potential of planning.

The objective of this presentation is to outline ways in which planning can be enhanced across organizational levels within an institution. My premises are three. One, planning must become a pervasive organizational activity; it must penetrate into every organizational sector over the long run. Two, planning is not something apart from management - planning is a line management function, not merely a central staff function. Three, planning needs to be understood and implemented as a socio-political activity as well as a technical activity. At the core planning is a human activity.

The question then is how to support, reinforce, and enhance individual and organizational behavior which will lead to effective, pervasive planning.

I will sketch some actual examples of institutional planning and analyze them from centralized/decentralized perspectives. Finally, I will draw some generalization about planning, giving particular attention to ways in which effective human planning behavior can be facilitated.

Behavioral Requirements

A behavioral approach to planning benefits from an understanding of the kinds of behavior that are required of people in order for the organization to function effectively over the long run (Cummings & Schwab; Katz & Kahn).

The key behaviors are: 1) join and remain; 2) perform role dependably; 3) provide effort above the minimum; 4) exhibit adaptive, innovative behavior; and 5) perform cooperatively. (See A-2.)

Role Dependability - Planning needs to be clearly incoporated as an expected function of managers and administrators, and people need to be provided with the education and training to carry out the expected role.

Effort Above the Minimum - In order for an organization to be effective, rather than merely surviving, there is need for people to provide more than minimal efforts. That is, there is need for leadership. Planning requires above average leadership behavior to determine goals and directions, and to direct behavior toward organizational goals.

Adaptive Behavior - Given that we work in a dynamic, complex environment, it is impossible to specify in advance all the requirements of an individual's role. Therefore, organizations require individuals to engage in spontaneous, adaptive, innovative behavior. These behaviors are critical to planning.

Cooperative Behavior - It is not sufficient that an individual do his or her own job well; organizations require cooperative, integrative behavior. This kind of behavior is likewise central to effective planning.

Behavioral Paradoxes - Planners are confronted with a number of behavioral paradoxes. We don't like to be subjected to orderly procedures or to be controlled, but we do like some order, predictability, and some control over our destiny. Even in higher education institutions many of us don't like to think and write, but we appreciate many of the results of critical thinking and writing. We don't like to close off our options, to make choices, but we do desire commitment. In brief, we like many of the potential benefits of

planning, but not activities associated with planning.

In the realm of planning we must learn to deal with these conflicts. One means of promoting effective behavior is to build into the planning process factors which motivate and reward people. (See A-2.)

Conditions Which Facilitate Planning

Persons experienced in planning have concluded that there are key conditions to be met before an institution undertakes the design and implementation of planning (see A-1): 1) some agreement that problems do exist, and some agreement on the nature and extent of the problems; 2) widely felt need to "do something"; 3) top administrative support and involvement; 4) opportunities to plan; 5) capacity to plan - skills and resources; 6) some stability of leadership; 7) absence of immediate crisis; and 8) trust.

If most of these conditions do not exist, then planning probably should not be undertaken. A larger question is whether the institution situation can be best served by planning or by some other approach to coping with problems. Institutions have engaged in planning, unproductively, because it was the "thing to do" or because of lack of understanding about the nature and potential outcomes of planning (see A-3, A-10, Lelong, et al.).

Multi-Level Institutional Planning

When it comes to planning, most of our institutions are at different stages of development. Therefore, I will sketch some examples and make some generalizations about different phases: design; initial implementation; and maintenance and improvement of an ongoing process.

Designing a Planning Process - Key points to keep in mind at the design stage are:

1) Planning requires continuing direction. Therefore an outcome of the design stage might well be clear goals for planning (not merely an identification of activities to be carried out), and a "plan for planning."

2) Designing a complete, comprehensive process at one point in time is difficult, if not impossible. This difficulty may be accommodated by taking an evolutionary approach to design.

3) Further, effective planning spans organizational levels and is facilitated by a process that has some benefits for multiple levels, not by one that merely involves inputs from various levels.

4) However, planning cannot be "all things." Planning should "work" for several organizational levels, but there is danger in "overcompromising" to the extent that the process satisfies no one.

5) Effective planning is congruent with the needs, norms, style, and values of the institution. Generally, an institution will benefit from specially adapting a process rather than adopting the approach of another college. Likewise planning is facilitated by seriously appraising needs before establishing a structure. Further, the process must be congruent with the style and the governance system of the institution.

6) Finally, since planning implies changing the way people behave and relate to each other, these anticipated changes must be feasible and realistic (see A-4, A-5, A-6).

Design Examples - The recent planning history at the University of Michigan began with the appointment of a new president and vice president for state relations and planning (1968). Then, in 1972, a University Long Range Planning Committee was established. Finally, in 1974 a new vice-president for academic affairs was appointed and, in turn, the Office of

Institutional Research became the Office of Academic Planning and Analysis.

One point is clear. Initiatives tended to be associated with changes in key leadership positions. Factors which encouraged the Michigan efforts to initiate planning have included: 1) presidential support (but not active involvement); 2) faculty support; 3) some felt need to plan because of a sense of drift and increasing financial problems, and 4) evolving design.

Problems with Michigan's design efforts have been numerous. 1) Formal structure (creation of VP, Long Range Planning Committee, and Office of Academic Planning)all preceded systematic diagnosis. 2) Design efforts have been more technical and activity-oriented, than outcome and behavior oriented. 3) Planning is only beginning to address issues beyond the central level. 4) A design problem still not satisfactorily resolved is how to achieve meaningful faculty participation. Faculty have been included in an advisory capacity at the central level, but without success for the most part.

In contrast to Michigan, the University of Minnesota has created a planning council of faculty, line administrators, and staff to assist in the design of planning. The council has invited to campus persons experienced in planning at other universities.

Conditions which are facilitating Minnesota's efforts include: 1) wide participation in design; 2) serious, systematic attempts to address issues and to tailor the process to the institution; 3) strong presidential commitment and involvement; 4) support from deans; 5) good timing for introduction; and 6) a feasible initial effort.

Implementing Planning - Key points to be made about implementation are that:

1) Implementation does not automatically flow from the design process. Implementation can be facilitated by balanced attention to human factors as well as to the technical aspects of planning. Implementation may benefit from an explicit strategy and plan itself.

2) Effective planning and meaningful participation will probably require new knowledge and skills by people at all levels and the effort will require continuing direction. Implementation can be facilitated by clear institutional guidelines and assumptions, by ongoing executive involvement and ongoing education and training.

3) It may seem self-evident but it bears repeating: planning activities must be done, and done well in order to achieve credibility. Planning is facilitated by expecting the "possible" in amount of work and by requiring high performance (not perfection). Planning is reinforced by staff and/or administrations who perform a monitoring and quality control function.

4) Motivation, incentive and rewards are central to implementing and perpetuating planning. People are motivated by salient goals; planning will be of mixed importance. Behavior is influenced by expectations that plans and planning can and will make a difference, and by receiving rewards--intrinsic and/or extrinsic--for planning. Implementation can be facilitated by openess and by providing rapid feedback between levels. Further, planning is facilitated by linking authority/responsibility for planning with authority/responsibility for implementing plans, and by providing some incentives and capacity for implementation such as some budgetary discretion. (A-7, A-8).

Implementation Examples - In the mid-70's the University of Pennsylvania moved from a traditional expense budgeting system to a decentralized, responsibility-center approach to planning and budgeting (Zemsky, etal). With the change, schools and colleges became responsible for revenues as well as for full operating expenses (including utilities, central administrative overhead and the like).

Implementation of the Penn Planning System was facilitated by: 1) strong executive support and involvement; 2) commitment to decentralized planning and budgeting; 3) incentives for increasing revenue and controlling costs and 4) potential for improved efficiency and effectiveness.

The problems and weaknesses which emerged at Penn were: 1) underestimated implementation time and difficulty; 2) heightened conflict between central administration and units, and among units themselves; 3) declining trust; 4) inadequate leadership and management skills among some deans and directors; 5) inadequate information system (geared to central not unit needs, inadequate revenue tracking); 6) inability of some colleges to increase revenues to meet rising costs; and 7) dysfunctional internal academic behavior--declining inter-unit cooperation and declining cross-college registrations. The experience at Penn uncovered some of the limits of decentralization.

In contrast the University of Michigan began a three-year, three-phase effort to introduce more systematic planning and evaluation in the Academic Affairs area in 1975. The stages included: development of objectives by units; evaluation of academic programs and academic services; and development of planning agreements between schools/colleges and Academic Affairs. A continuing internal reallocation fund has been established by reducing all base budgets by 1% a year.

The weaknesses and problems of Michigan efforts included: 1) initial lack of clear central guidelines and assumptions; 2) collegiate doubts that tough executive decisions would be made; 3) work required of departments but no real unit-level planning accomplished, little or no feedback to departments from colleges or central administration; 4) inability of central staff and faculty to deal with the mass of information; 5) unrealistic workloads in evaluation phase and 6) loss of faculty support.

Some of the elements and changes which facilitated the work at Michigan included: 1) process changed based on formative evaluation and unit feedback; 2) budget cycle changed to enhance planning; 3) reallocation fund provided incentives and opportunities for academic units; reallocation penetrated to the departmental level giving colleges more leverage; used multi-year and matching allocation strategies; 4) matching funds provided for external evaluation; 5) central guidelines and priority statements provided more context for units; and 6) joint planning agreements (rather than isolated unit plans) between Academic Affairs and schools/colleges.

Maintaining and Improving Planning - Basic points related to design and implementation hold true for maintaining and improving planning. However, new efforts are needed for effective, ongoing planning.

1) Ongoing planning requires results attributable to prior planning. The planning process is reinforced if executives and line administrators take actions based on planning and if units are guided past planning.

2) Operational objectives of planning and the process itself need to be changed periodically; to continue, the planning process should be cost effective. Adaptation can be assisted by formative evaluation.

3) Ongoing planning requires continuing executive and line leadership and involvement. This is facilitated by some stability of key personnel, and by selecting, evaluating, and rewarding administrators for their planning skills and performance.

4) Ongoing planning requires meaningful participation, continuing education and communication. The objectives are facilitated by providing multiple opportunities and degrees of involvement, and by providing orientation, education and training which enable skillful participation.

5) There is no "one best way" to plan. In a dynamic environment and diverse institution, a planning process that deliberately incorporates a variety of activities and approaches (systematic and intuitive), and accommodates a variety of styles is likely to be more effective than a more limited, singular approach (see A-9).

Example of Ongoing Planning - In the early 70's Stanford University faced a severe and persisting gap between projected revenues and projected expenditures. The University was successful in implementing a University-wide process which resulted in accomplishing the initial operational objective of the planning effort: closing the budgetary gap. The next step was to maintain academic quality under financial equilibrium. Likewise the University of Michigan is close to completing a cycle of systematic planning within Academic Affairs. A challenge now facing both institutions is how to keep a successful planning effort going.

At this point the institutions have several things going for them. Having accomplished some initial objectives, the institutions are in a better position to continue planning than before. Valuable experience has been gained. Some changes can be attributed to planning.

The irony is that at Stanford after very successful results and some success at establishing a planning process, there is now less feeling of urgency for planning at the grass roots, and the original goals of closing the budget gap and maintaining budget equilibrium have diminished motivational power. The general challenge at these and other institutions with planning experience is one of finding new visions and goals to motivate and guide planning. The specific, persisting problem of the 80's is how to reward good planning behavior in the face of financial stringency. To paraphrase Ackoff, not to do planning well is not a sin, but to settle for doing it less than well is.

Outcomes of Planning

Planning efforts have often labored under excessive expectations; dramatic institutional change attributable to planning has rarely happened. However, institutions engaged in planning have reported other significant outcomes: 1) increased communication across levels; 2) different information for current decision making; 3) heightened awareness of the institutional situation, of goals, relationships, and accomplishments; 4) some reduction of uncertainty; greater influence and control over own destiny; 5) impetus to get things going; 6) changes speeded up; 7) increased capacity to respond to opportunities and problems in a more timely fashion with less disruption; and 8) improved training and development for managers and administrators (A-10, Lelong, et al).

While more modest than many claims for planning, there are important organizational outcomes.

Planning as Learning

The premises of this presentation are that planning: 1) must become pervasive; 2) must be an integral part of management; and 3) must be approached as a human as well as a technical process. The question addressed has been how to facilitate and reinforce effective planning behavior. For the institutional examples it is apparent that no process works to great perfection. As planners we must continue to learn how to plan and to assist others in learning to plan. To paraphrase Follett the process is: 1) to take an experimental attitude; 2) to become experience conscious; 3) to organize and assess the value of experience; 4) to share experience; and 5) to use experience (A-11). With a learning attitude and approach, pervasive planning may become a reality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cummings, L. L. and Schwab, D. P., Performance in Organizations: Determinants and Appraisal. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1973.

Friedman, J. and Hudson, B., "Knowledge and Action: A Guide to Planning Theory." AIP Journal, January 1974.

Galbraith, J. R., Organizational Design. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1977.

Katz, D. and Kahn, R. L., The Social Psychology of Organizations (second edition). New York: Wiley, 1978.

Lelong, D. C., Peterson, M. W., Poulton, N. L., and Hinman, M. M., Ideas in Action: Planning Design and Practice in Universities. forthcoming (1979), monograph on planning based on experiences of six major research universities.

Steers, R. M., Organizational Effectiveness, A Behavioral View. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing Co., 1977.

Steiner, G. A., Strategic Planning. New York: The Free Press, 1979.

Wildarsky, A., "If Planning is Everything, Maybe It's Nothing." Policy Sciences. Vol. 4, 1973.

Zemsky, R., Porter, R. and Oedel, L. P., "Decentralized Planning: To Share Responsibility." Educational Record, Vol. 9, #3, Summer 1978.

CONDITIONS WHICH FACILITATE THE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PLANNING

. . . SOME AGREEMENT THAT THERE ARE PROBLEMS, ON THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF PROBLEMS.

. . . WIDELY FELT NEED TO "DO SOMETHING"

. . . TOP MANAGEMENT SUPPORT AND INVOLVEMENT

. . . OPPORTUNITIES OR OCCASIONS TO PLAN

. . . CAPACITY TO PLAN: SKILLS AND RESOURCES

. . . SOME STABILITY OF LEADERSHIP

. . . ABSENCE OF IMMEDIATE CRISIS

. . . TRUST

. . . BEHAVIOR ESSENTIAL FOR EFFECTIVE ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTIONING

. . JOIN AND REMAIN

. . PERFORM ROLE DEPENDABLY (GOAL-DIRECTED BEHAVIOR)

. . PROVIDE EFFORT ABOVE MINIMUM (LEADERSHIP)

. . EXHIBIT ADAPTIVE, INNOVATIVE BEHAVIOR

. . PERFORM COOPERATIVELY

. . . MOTIVATIONS AND REWARDS

. . RULES, POLICIES, AUTHORITY

. . SYSTEM REWARDS (ACCRUING TO ALL MEMBERS)

. . GROUP REWARDS

. . INDIVIDUAL REWARDS

. . LEADERSHIP OF OTHERS

. . GROUP ACCEPTANCE AND RECOGNITION

. . INVOLVEMENT AND PARTICIPATION

. . IDENTIFICATION WITH GOALS

. . GROWTH AND ADVANCEMENT

. . ACHIEVEMENT

. . THE WORK ITSELF

. . IDEOLOGY

. . . THE NATURE OF PLANNING

. . PLANNING IS DONE FOR A VARIETY OF PURPOSES
. FACILITATED BY CLARITY OF AND AGREEMENT ON PURPOSES

. . PLANNING IS PART OF MANAGEMENT NOT A SEPARATE PROCESS
. FACILITATED BY INTEGRATION WITH OTHER ASPECTS OF LINE MANAGEMENT

. . PLANNING IS SOCIO-POLITICAL AS WELL AS TECHNICAL-RATIONAL
. FACILITATED BY TAKING INTO ACCOUNT HUMAN AS WELL AS TECHNICAL FACTORS IN THE DESIGN

. . PLANNING IS A PERVASIVE ORGANIZATIONAL ACTIVITY
. FACILITATED BY PROVIDING INCENTIVES AND SUPPORT AT EACH ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL

. . THERE IS NO "ONE BEST WAY" TO PLAN
. FACILITATED BY BUILDING ON BOTH SYSTEMATIC AND INTUITIVE APPROACHES

. . EFFECTIVE PLANNING IS AN ONGOING ACTIVITY
. FACILITATED BY DEVELOPING A PROCESS THAT WILL BE CONTINUED AS WELL AS PRODUCING PLANS AT ONE POINT IN TIME.

. . . DESIGNING A PLANNING PROCESS

. . PLANNING REQUIRES CONTINUING DIRECTION

. FACILITATED BY DEVELOPING GOALS AND A "PLAN FOR PLANNING" NOT MERELY DESIGNING A PROCESS

. . WHAT PLANNING IS OR SHOULD BE IS NOT CLEAR IN MOST INSTITUTIONS; NEED TO CREATE A CLIMATE FOR PLANNING

. FACILITATED BY DELIBERATE EFFORTS TO LEARN AND TO EDUCATE THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY ABOUT THE NATURE OF PLANNING

. FACILITATED BY WIDE PARTICIPATION IN DESIGN

. FACILITATED BY ATTEMPTING TO ASK "GOOD QUESTIONS" NOT JUST PROVIDE "GOOD ANSWERS"

. . DESIGNING A COMPLETE, COMPREHENSIVE PROCESS AT ONE POINT IN TIME IS DIFFICULT

. FACILITATED BY APPROACHING DESIGN IN AN EVOLUTIONARY MANNER, BY TAKING A LEARNING ATTITUDE TO PLANNING

. . EFFECTIVE PLANNING IS CONGRUENT WITH NEEDS AND NORMS OF THE INSTITUTION

. FACILITATED BY APPRAISING NEEDS BEFORE ESTABLISHING STRUCTURE AND PROCESS

. FACILITATED BY ADAPTING RATHER THAN ADOPTING PROCESS AND CONTENT

. FACILITATED BY DESIGNING A PROCESS THAT MATCHES THE MANAGEMENT STYLE AND GOVERNANCE SYSTEM OF THE INSTITUTION (OR ONE WHICH DEPENDS ON FEASIBLE CHANGES)

. . . DESIGNING A PLANNING PROCESS -- CONTINUED

. . NEW PLANNING EFFORTS WILL BE INFLUENCED BY PAST INSTITUTIONAL HISTORY AND PRESENT MANAGEMENT STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS

. FACILITATED BY BUILDING FROM HISTORY AND STRENGTH RATHER THAN BY DEVELOPING DISJOINTED EFFORTS

. . EFFECTIVE PLANNING SPANS ORGANIZATIONAL LEVELS

. FACILITATED BY A PLANNING PROCESS WHICH BENEFITS MULTIPLE LEVELS NOT MERELY INVOLVING MULTIPLE LEVELS

. . AN INITIAL PLANNING EFFORT CANNOT BE "ALL THINGS", CANNOT SOLVE ALL INSTITUTIONAL PROBLEMS

. FACILITATED BY A PROCESS THAT "WORKS" FOR SEVERAL KEY LEVELS OR SECTORS, RATHER THAN AN "OVERCOMPROMISED" PROCESS THAT SATISFIES NO ONE

. FACILITATED BY LIMITING THE INITIAL SCOPE

. . PLANNING IMPLIES CHANGING THE WAY PEOPLE AND ORGANIZATIONS BEHAVE AND RELATE TO EACH OTHER

. FACILITATED BY PROCESS THAT ENTAILS FEASIBLE AND REALISTIC BEHAVIOR CHANGES

PLANNING DESIGN CHOICES

. . . FORMALITY - INFORMALITY

. . . COMPREHENSIVE - SELECTIVE

. . . COMPLETE - PHASED

. . . STRATEGIC - OPERATIONAL

. . . INTEGRATED - COORDINATED - INDEPENDENT

. . . SYSTEMATIC - INTUITIVE

. . . TIME ORIENTATION

. . . LEVEL OF SOPHISTICATION

. . . LEVEL(S) OF INITIATION

. . . IMPLEMENTATION OF PLANNING

. . A "CONVENIENT" TIME TO IMPLEMENT PLANNING DOES NOT EXIST

. FACILITATED BY SENSITIVITY TO OTHER COMMITMENTS AND TO THE TIMING OF KEY RELATED ACTIVITIES (BUDGETING)

. . IMPLEMENTATION DOES NOT FLOW AUTOMATICALLY FROM THE PROCESS DESIGN

. FACILITATED BY AN EXPLICIT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND STRATEGY

. FACILITATED BY BALANCED ATTENTION TO SOCIO-POLITICAL ISSUES AS WELL AS TECHNICAL-RATIONAL ELEMENTS

. . EFFECTIVE PLANNING AND MEANINGFUL PARTICIPATION REQUIRE NEW KNOWLEDGE AND NEW SKILLS

. FACILITATED BY PROVIDING ONGOING EDUCATION, TRAINING AND SUPPORT

. . MULTI-LEVEL PLANNING REQUIRES CONTINUING DIRECTION AND SUPPORT

. FACILITATED BY ONGOING INVOLVEMENT OF CENTRAL EXECUTIVES AND LINE ADMINISTRATORS

. FACILITATED BY INSTITUTIONAL GUIDELINES AND ASSUMPTIONS

. FACILITATED BY PLANNING STAFF

. . DESIGN IS NOT PERFECT

. IMPLEMENTATION IS FACILITATED BY ADAPTATIONS BASED ON EXPERIENCE AND FEEDBACK

. FACILITATED BY FLEXIBILITY OF RESPONSE FORMATS

. . . IMPLEMENTATION OF PLANNING -- CONTINUED

. . PLANNING ACTIVITIES MUST BE DONE, DONE WELL

. FACILITATED BY SETTING REASONABLE WORK LEVELS AND EXPECTING HIGH PERFORMANCE (NOT PERFECTION)

. REINFORCED BY FOLLOW-UP AND "QUALITY CONTROL"

. . PLANNING ≠ PLANS ≠ PAPER

. PLANNING FACILITATED BY A BALANCE OF FACE-TO-FACE AND PAPER INTERACTIONS

. FACILITATED BY A RANGE OF STRUCTURE AND FORMALITY

. . MOTIVATION, SUPPORT, REWARD, AND RESULTS ARE CENTRAL TO IMPLEMENTATION

. MOTIVATED BY SALIENT GOALS, BY PERCEIVED ABILITY TO CARRY OUT ACTIVITIES, BY EXPECTATIONS THAT PLANS AND PLANNING CAN AND WILL MAKE A DIFFERENCE, BY EXPECTATIONS OF DESIRABLE REWARDS

. FACILITATED BY OPENNESS, BY PROVIDING SOME IMMEDIATE FEEDBACK BETWEEN LEVELS, BY SEEING SOME SHORT-RUN USE AND RESULTS

. FACILITATED BY MUTUAL PLANNING AGREEMENTS BETWEEN UNITS/LEVELS

. FACILITATED BY LINKING AUTHORITY/RESPONSIBILITY FOR PLANNING WITH AUTHORITY/RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTING PLANS, BY PROVIDING SUPPORT AND INCENTIVES (BUDGET DISCRETION)

. . . MAINTAINING AND IMPROVING PLANNING

. . ONGOING PLANNING REQUIRES RESULTS ATTRIBUTABLE TO PRIOR PLANNING

. FACILITATED BY HAVING GUIDELINES AND PLANS THAT COVER MOST SIGNIGICANT FACTORS AND BY HAVING MANY DECISIONS GUIDED BY THE PLANNING PROCESS.

. . OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES OF PLANNING AND THE PROCESS ITSELF NEED TO BE ADAPTED PERIODICALLY; MUST BE COST EFFECTIVE

. FACILITATED BY FORMATIVE EVALUATION OF THE PROCESS, BY A LEARNING ATTITUDE TO PLANNING.

. . ONGOING PLANNING REQUIRES CONTINUING EXECUTIVE AND LINE LEADERSHIP

. FACILITATED BY SOME STABILITY OF PERSONNEL, AND BY SELECTING, EVALUATING, AND REWARDING ADMINISTRATORS FOR THEIR PLANNING ATTITUDES AND SKILLS.

. . ONGOING PLANNING REQUIRES MEANINGFUL PARTICIPATION

. FACILITATED BY A PROCESS THAT PROVIDES MULTIPLE OPPORTUNITIES TO PARTICIPATE AT EACH LEVEL, AND BY PROVIDING PEOPLE WITH THE KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS TO PARTICIPATE.

. . ONGOING PLANNING REQUIRES CONTINUING EDUCATION AND COMMUNICATION

. FACILITATED BY ORIENTATION OF PERSONS NEW TO INSTITUTION AND NEW TO LEADERSHIP POSITIONS AND BY DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIALS OUTLINING THE PURPOSES AND PROCESSES OF PLANNING.

OUTCOMES OF PLANNING

. . . INCREASED COMMUNICATION - VERTICAL, HORIZONTAL, LONGITUDINAL

. . . DIFFERENT INFORMATION FOR CURRENT DECISION MAKING

. . . HEIGHTENED AWARENESS OF INSTITUTIONAL SITUATION, OF GOALS, DIRECTIONS, RELATIONSHIPS, AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

. . . SOME REDUCTION OF UNCERTAINTY: GREATER INFLUENCE AND CONTROL OVER OWN DESTINY

. . . IMPETUS TO "GET THINGS GOING"

. . . ADAPTATION SPEEDED UP

. . . INCREASED CAPACITY TO RESPOND TO OPPORTUNITIES AND PROBLEMS IN A TIMELY FASHION WITH LESS DISRUPTION

. . . IMPROVED TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT OF MANAGERS

. . . REWARDS AND SATISFACTION OF PARTICIPATION AND ACCOMPLISHMENT OF OBJECTIVES

FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCE PLANNING

. . . PURPOSES OF PLANNING
- . STRATEGIC
- . TACTICAL

. . . INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS
- . SIZE, MATURITY
- . PURPOSE/COMPLEXITY
- . RESOURCES, PLANNING EXPERIENCE
- . VALUES, NORMS, HISTORY

. . . ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS
- . COMPLEXITY
- . TURBULENCE
- . UNCERTAINTY

. . . NATURE OF WORK
- . LABOR INTENSIVENESS
- . DEGREE OF TECHNOLOGY
- . LENGTH OF PRODUCTION CYCLE
- . INTERDEPENDENT/INTEGRATED
- . MARKET LEAD TIME

. . . NATURE OF PROBLEMS
- . NEW-OLD
- . TIME SPAN

. . . MANAGEMENT STYLE, ORIENTATION, AND SKILLS
- . AUTHORITARIAN-PARTICIPATIVE
- . SYSTEMATIC-INTUITIVE
- . EXPERIENCED-INEXPERIENCED

PLANNING AS LEARNING

. . . TAKE AN EXPERIMENTAL ATTITUDE

. . . BECOME EXPERIENCE CONSCIOUS

. . . ORGANIZE AND ASSESS THE VALUE OF EXPERIENCE

. . . SHARE EXPERIENCES

. . . USE EXPERIENCE

FACILITATING ORGANIZATIONALLY PERVASIVE PLANNING BEHAVIORS

T. Michael Elliott

Introduction

Our purpose today is to present four coordinated papers which have as their common theme the assertion that persons whose professional identity and job description includes organizational planning should manage the planning process by encouraging planning behaviors on the parts of other individuals, for whom such roles are not formally identified, throughout the organization. Specifically, in an institutional setting, a director of analysis and planning or institutional research and planning or some analogous position should take as part of his/her task the facilitating of planning activities in the schools, colleges, and departments of the institution, and also in other, nonacademic segments of the organization. Similarly, at the state level, planners in state-wide coordinating agencies should serve a facilitating function as regards planning for individual institutions.

Centralization/Decentralization and Planning

In discussing almost any function of the management or administration of a complex organization, one invariably returns to the classic issue of centralization versus decentralization. Several models have been developed for organizational schemes which reflect the polar extremes of both positions. In practice, managers try to strike the appropriate balance between centralized and decentralized processes *apropos* of a given situation. Striking this balance means making a series of decisions about the placing of powers and activities at different loci in the organization. Through centralization of activities at relatively high levels in the organization, it is alleged to be possible to achieve uniformity in decisions, utilize expertise, and pinpoint responsibility for the consequences of actions. Decentralization, on the other hand, is held to make possible quicker and more locally relevant decisions, and prevent the partial paralysis which may be caused by an overloaded central management structure. The literature of organization theory is

rich with analyses of these issues, and need not be reviewed here. Suffice to say that most analysts have concluded that ideal management structures are those which maximize decentralization to the extent possible without suffering fragmentation in the pursuit of overall organizational goals.

In the past, movement toward decentralization proved inevitable in the evolution of complex organizations, whether they be corporate enterprises or universities. As organizations grew and became more complex, with more diverse activities necessary to their functioning and increasingly diverse constitutencies with whom the organization must interact, decentralization became inevitable. That is, it became impossible for a central management structure of a larger organization to possess the knowledge to effectively deal, at least in a timely manner, with the myriad problems confronted throughout the organization. With this appropriate response of decentralization, however, comes a concomitant problem. That is, as decentralization increases, subsystems must, necessarily, increasingly act without benefit of knowledge, experience, or information which may exist elsewhere in the organization. Further, subsystem goals may evolve which are not supportive of, or are even contrary to, overall organizational goals.

In an environment which seemed from the perspective of institutions of higher education to be increasingly hostile, there has been a shift over the last decade or so in the other direction, toward centralization of administrative processes. Experts in various phases of administrative processes have proliferated, and have centralized their authority in their respective areas of speciality. As institutions have been called upon to make single, institutional responses to new issues, decision making regarding those responses has necessarily been forced into the central administrative structure. The outside pressures for institutional responses have not been tolerant of separate responses from the faculties of the separate schools and colleges. The students of a decade ago pressed for an institutional response to *in loco parentis*, or the nation's foreign policy. An institutional response is required to the question of divestiture. The legislature, or a church, wants an institutional response regarding the accountability of the institution for

its stewardship of the resources made available by its sponsors. All of these kinds of pressures have forced centralization, although that process has seldom been explicitly recognized in a series of conscious decisions by institutional boards or administrators. Rather, there has existed a centripetal evolution of behavior patterns which has been tacitly accepted with little examination, by all concerned.

Information Systems and Centralization

With the advent of automated information systems, the information equation has shifted. Information systems, theoretically at least, make it possible for a full range of information to be available to a centralized management structure. Thus, information management systems aided the reversal of "natural" decentralization trends in large organizations. Unfortunately, the benefits of decentralization were not simply a means of coping with the lack of central information systems. Rather, they were also a means of developing creativity and innovation on the part of subsystems within the organization, thus increasing both the appropriateness of the organization's response to its environment and the morale and productivity of the individuals who constitute those subsystems. If an organization chooses for these reasons to pursue a decentralized model out of choice rather than necessity, it is possible that its new technological information systems can support those objectives. If a computerized information system can make a full range of information available to the top management of an organization, why cannot that information be equally accessible to the full range of managers within the organization? I earlier observed that one criticism of decentralized systems is that a decentralized unit may be operating without sufficient or full knowledge of the activities of another unit of the system. Information systems can overcome such problems, but careful management is yet required to assure that organizational goal fragmentation does not occur.

Collegiality and Centralization

A college is the archetype of the collegial organization. The collegial form of American higher education can reasonably be traced to the University

of Paris several centuries ago. As that model evolved, was adopted by the English universities at Cambridge and Oxford, and ultimately imported to the Colonies, it provided for a community of independent professionals who banded together in a formal organization only because of the convenience such an organization allowed in the pursuit of their individual scholarly and teaching activities. In its pure form, a collegial organization may be said to be absolutely governed by this collective of professionals. Administrators, to the extent that they are employed, are relegated to the housekeeping activities necessary to keep the organization functioning, and are in every event subordinate to the collegium.

In practice, most institutions of higher education have strayed far from this ideal. Further, the pressures for continuing centralization in university administration are great. As most institutions prepare to adapt to an environment characterized not by growth, but by stability or decline, collegial models break down. Contraction requires hard decisions. The competing self-interests of the several subsystems ultimately do not allow such a decision to be made collectively. These difficulties are illustrated by reallocation processes necessitated in recent years in many institutions. As institutions have been forced to look to the contraction of their existing operation as a source of funds for desired new programs, the typical response has been an "across the board" reduction of x percent. Such an approach avoids choosing among the interests of subsystems, and has the virtue of apparent equity. Institutions find, at least in my experience, that such an approach is possible only for one or two years, after which they may not go to that well again without seriously hampering the goals of the total institution. At that point, centralized decisions must be made.

The proliferation of administrative support services, ranging from admissions to accounting and placement to purchasing, has created more forces for centralization. Such support services necessarily cross the boundaries of the decentralized units and through necessary procedural requirements, effectively reduce the independence of organization subsystems.

The Role of Planners

The foregoing was intended to provide a context for the consideration of the role of the professional planner in higher education. Institutional researchers may in the beginning of the profession, have evolved from "describers," but have, quite intentionally, moved progressively into the mode of being "prescribers." The third annual forum of this association, and the first to have a stated theme, was on "The Role of Institutional Research and Planning." That emphasis has continued. At the same time, institutional research has undergone an evolutionary process of increasing professionalism. We have yet avoided a narrow definition of the appropriate background for our trade, with the resulting loss of diversity among practitioners such a definition would create. We are still blessed by a wide range of traditional disciplinary approaches to our problems. To my knowledge, no one has yet started offering a specialized doctorate in the field of institutional research, and we will hope that shall not happen. Thus, while we have increasingly become specialists, we remain specialists who attempt to take the generalist's view of planning for the total organization.

Planners are, typically, clearly identified as part of the central administration. Although I have not conducted a systematic survey of the literature on this point, my impression is that our writing on the organizational problems of the planning function has fairly uniformly insisted that it be near the center of the organization. In fact, the typical model would suggest that the planning function "report to the president in order to assure the commitment of top management to planning decisions." Yet, something is wrong. Most institutional research, research and planning, analysis and planning, or institutional planning and development offices, by whatever name they are known, are located centrally. But what planners among us have not felt the frustration of good plans going unimplemented? How often have we been able to identify, without ambiguity, a clear solution based on the information available to us, and yet been unable to cause the appropriate organizational response?

The answer, I believe, requires that we as planners look at our institutions or systems of institutions as hybrid organizations, recognizing those functions that are centralized and those that are not. That is, despite the centralization trends reviewed earlier, institutions of higher education retain highly fragmented authority structures as regards many of the organization's activities. This means that the best analyses and plans conducted in a central planning office can be thwarted or ignored by the action of a subunit either unaware of, or uncaring of, such central planning activities. A classic example might be the planner who devotes many months of work to a highly detailed enrollment forecasting system which, given programmatic enrollment forecasts, projects course by course enrollment demand, based on past history, which can then be used to evaluate staffing requirements against existing faculty resources. Such an elegant model is destroyed in a moment when a faculty committee decides to increase the humanities requirements for an AB from nine to fifteen hours. Another basis of plans which fail to be implemented, is the fact that the plans are solutions to problems identified by planners, but those problems may not even be perceived by relevant others. That is, if a school or college does not recognize the existence of a problem, it is not likely to be motivated to change its behavior toward the end of solving that problem. In addition to identifying a technically adequate solution, the planner must be sure it becomes an organizationally acceptable solution.

Finally, parallel to the problem of implementation of plans derived centrally are questions of the adequacy of such plans relative to plans which might be created by persons elsewhere in the organization. However much information we amass and access through our green and white printout sheets, or our flickering cathode ray terminals, there exists throughout the institution a wisdom that exceeds that information. Such wisdom resides in the persons whose experience and intimate contact with a situation or problem cannot be stored in a computer. The management problem in planning must include consideration of means of tapping that wisdom.

The solution to all of these concerns is elusive, but must be pursued by the planner. One approach which can be useful is to perceive the planning

problem as a management task of facilitating decentralized planning behaviors that are part of, or complement, central planning activities. The facilitating planner may enable, cajole, persuade, entice, or force such planning activities, and the technique used may vary from situation to situation. Whatever the technique, it is our assertion today that the total institutional planning efforts will be maximally effective in preparing the institution for the future when all of its constituent parts are involved in, and party to, the planning process, not just through committee structures, but through actual participation.

Pervasive Planning

The purpose of this brief introduction has been to describe a problem: how can planners be managers (facilitators) of planning processes that pervade an institution or system of higher education. Given this statement of the problem, we would like to propose a solution by illustration. We have three brief presentations now which we hope will illustrate how the problem of facilitating pervasive planning can be approached. We will have first a description of how the problem has been addressed in several large universities, secondly examples in the context of a state system of higher education from the perspective of a planner in a statewide coordinating board, and finally, again in an institutional context, a description of how organizationally pervasive planning can be facilitated through making available a specific planning tool.

TME:fht

FACILITATING PERVASIVE PLANNING: THE STATE PERSPECTIVE

Loretta Glaze Elliott

To some there may be an apparent contradiction implied in a state-level perspective on facilitating pervasive planning behavior. It is not so incongruous as it may at first seem, however, for the relationship between a state-level higher education agency and the institutions of higher education within the state can provide an excellent illustration of how decentralized planning behaviors can be facilitated. This discussion addresses the relationships between a state-level coordinating agency for higher education and the institutions for which it has responsibility, and is drawn from my personal experiences with coordinating agencies in four states, those in Indiana, New Jersey, Tennessee and, now, Missouri.

Most state coordinating agencies, and all four where I have worked, have, among other charges, statutory authority and responsiblity for state-wide planning. Three of the four have been the designated 1202 Commission in the state with federally-supported planning responsibility. Staff in these agencies all recognized, however, that this broadly-mandated planning charge can be carried out by several means, many of which have the effect of placing much of the responsibility for planning at the institutional level. The central task, therefore, is facilitating pervasive planning!

As the conceptual basis for this discussion, consider the process of facilitating planning behavior as a continuum. Assume that at the left end of the continuum, the process of facilitating is one of encouraging, making easier, or, perhaps, making possible, certain planning activities or behaviors. Near the middle of the continuum is a process which includes actions intended to persuade or provoke the institution into planning behaviors. Finally, at the opposite end from the process of

gentle suggestion, "facilitating" may be a bit euphemistic for a process which, in fact, requires a planning response. The continuum of central efforts, then, ranges from a rather passive process to a quite active one.

Parallel to this continuum may be another which expresses the kind of relationship each kind of process evokes. As long as the state agency's role is a relatively passive one, relationships with the institution are friendly and without conflict. As the process becomes one of more intervention by the state agency, then some tensions may be introduced into the relationship. The persuasiveness of the state agency may be acknowledged with some chagrin by the institutions. The more responsive the behavior of the institutions to the initiatives of the state and the more trust which each side feels, the less active a role the state agency may feel compelled to assume. When the state agency perceives lack of responsiveness at the institutional level, the more active a role it assumes in the process. The possible consequence of this more active role at the requiring as opposed to the encouraging end of the process continuum, is a relationship based on mutual distrust and, perhaps, open conflict. This notion of these parallel continua is applicable to intrainstitutional planning as well as to state agency-institutional interaction, but the following examples relate only to the latter. The continuum concept is used as a structure for the discussion.

State coordinating agencies can facilitate planning at the institutional level in several ways. The data collection activities of a state coordinating agency may not only encourage planning at an institution, but may be a primary means of making some kinds of planning possible. Data collection at the state level has resulted, in most states, in the existence of a set of comparable data for all higher education institutions in the state. By publishing the data, the state agency can make this comparative information available for institutional use. Most states are publishing a statistical and/or analytic series of reports based on data provided by the institutions. Such reports can be used at the institutional level to understand better the environmental setting in which the institution is operating. State-wide trends can be identified

and evaluated. The availability of comparable data enables persons at both the state and institutional levels to look at institutions of like size and type on any of several common indices. Publication of such data on all higher education in the state can dispell myths, identify commonality as well as differences and provide for all a better understanding of the context in which planning should occur. Even for those institutions which look outside the state for peer institution comparisons, an awareness of trends within the state is useful.

A second way in which state level data collection can facilitate planning at the institutional level is by providing a lever for collection of data within the institution. In establishing the state level information system we are currently using in Missouri, a number of institutional planners confided in me how pleased they were that we were requesting some particular piece of data or report because he or she had been interested in such data for some time but had not been successful in making its collection and analysis an institutional priority. Now that our external agency is requiring the data the institutional planner will have the information, and not just for his or her own institution, but for all higher education institutions in the state.

There are other ways in which the state agency can encourage, suggest or even provoke planning behavior at institutions within the state. By conducting and publishing studies which clarify the issues and conditions affecting the future of higher education generally, the overall level of consciousness may be raised in such ways as to effect planning behavior at the institutions. Studies which present state-wide and regional demographic data and point out the potential implications of the decline in the traditional college-age population for enrollment in higher education in the state are an example. The rhetoric of declining or stabilizing enrollments becomes a matter of greater interest when population projections by age cohort are presented for one's own state and when these projections are analyzed alongside the current age distribution and geographic origin of one's student population. Presenting this kind of information can be quite provocative of reaction without a specific request or directive from the state level. Manpower studies

are also examples of state level activities which can be persuasive in bringing about a focussed assessment of the future. Such studies can serve to suggest programmatic fields where expansion as well as contraction may be indicated.

These have been examples of ways decentralized planning can be encouraged or suggested. Somewhat nearer the middle of the continuum described earlier are actions at the state level which more actively persuade or provoke institutional response and which may begin to affect the nature of agency-institution relationships. The state agency may play a significant role in effecting a response at the institutional level by raising issues and questions, but then placing responsibility for acting with the institutions. A state agency can be a positive impetus for the development of a specific approach to an issue and may be extremely useful in enabling institutional planners to overcome inertia within the institution. Activities which may be considered quite desirable by some but which do not demand immediacy among other competing issues can rise in priority at the institution when the state agency becomes involved or develops an interest.

Policies adopted at the state level may produce decentralized planning activities by persuading the institution that attention to a particular issue is in its own best interests. An example of how the state agency may focus institutional attention in a specific area is through the budgetary recommendation authority which most state coordinating agencies exercise. The preparation of recommendations for funding levels at state institutions is a significant way in which the coordinating agency exercises its policy-making authority. Often the policies implicit in those appropriations recommendations serve as an encouragement to specific planning activities which might otherwise not occur. For instance, this year the budgetary recommendations of the Coordinating Board in Missouri for the state senior institutions included, for the second year in a row, special funding for library acquisitions. While the institutions receive lump sum appropriations and can, and indeed should be able to, spend the money as they see appropriate, the message from the state capitol was clear, and strengthening libraries has become a state-wide

planning issue. Attention has been directed to an organized approach to making use of this special funding in the library area.

Other kinds of policies adopted by a state agency might be even more persuasive in their effect on putting the institution in a planning mode. Among the statutory authorities of many coordinating agencies is the power to review existing academic programs of the colleges and universities in the state. The exercise of that authority can be carried out by the state agency adopting a policy which places the responsibility for setting up a systematic process of program review back on the institutions. For example, in Missouri, the Coordinating Board has recently adopted a master plan which requires the institutions to set up a five-year cycle of review of existing programs and to provide copies of the reviews to the Coordinating Board through the Department of Higher Education. This policy evolved from an earlier draft of the master plan which placed the review at the state level. The spectre of potential state agency active involvement in this area was extremely effective in persuading the institutions that this activity should be a high institutional priority. This particular policy is an example of the way the state agency can play a role in bringing about activities at the institutional level which may have been considered but were not implemented because of the power of vested interests within the institution opposed to a potentially threatening process. While it is not politic for them to make public statements to this effect, there are surely instances where institutional administrators rather welcome the state agency donning a black hat in this manner.

At the right end of our conceptual continuum, the process becomes one in which the state agency assumes an active and direct role in stimulating a response at the institutional level by adopting policies which actually require action by the institution. Examples illustrate the varying implications these activities have on agency-institution relationships. An instance of required institutional response which would not be

expected to cause great concern at the institution relates to capital planning. Most state agencies prepare recommendations regarding funding for capital projects. In order to prepare rational capital recommendations for higher education throughout the state, the state agency should have some notion of its own long range approach to capital needs. Again, this can be accomplished by the coordinating agency looking first to the institutions. Certainly it would not be responsible behavior for the state agency to merely shuffle institutional capital plans to arrive at a shopping list of projects. On the other hand, a thoughtful review of well-developed institutional plans should result in a sound statewide approach to capital needs in higher education. To again use a Missouri example, our agency has requested each institution which receives state funding for capital to submit a five-year plan presenting its assessment of its own capital needs. Most institutions probably have such a plan. On the other hand, the external requirement will assure that any existing long range capital plan will receive a critical review to make certain it is up-to-date and reflects the most current assessment of future institutional priorities.

Finally, we may identify examples of state agency activities which may pose the most apparent contradiction, central activities resulting in decentralized responses. The state agency is responsible, sometimes, for bringing about planning behavior at the institutional level through exercising its own central planning authority. The requirement for institutional planning is most strongly provided from the state level when the coordinating agency itself becomes actively involved in prescriptive planning. Master planning efforts usually have as a goal, if not the universally-successful result, the provision of a framework in which institutional role and mission development occurs. State master plans typically assign responsibility within the state for associate, baccalaureate, and graduate education and for certain programmatic thrusts to specific institutions. Master plans sometimes raise and sometimes limit institutional aspirations and may lead to a re-thinking of the institution's future in light of the master plan. The detailed planning is left to the institutions but the central agency has provided the outline within which such refinement should occur.

Another example of a more active process of facilitating decentralized planning than the persuasive process discussed earlier is found in state initiatives in resource-sharing schemes. Many states are looking for ways of promoting the sharing of existing resources and of maximizing the benefits of future investments by means of specific centralized planning activities. For example, the potential for sharing of computing resources is currently being explored in Missouri by a task force of institutional personnel under the direction of the Department of Higher Education. The potential in library networking and resource sharing is being explored in many states. These are two ways in which state initiatives have the effect of creating a necessity within the institutions for attention to the future. In an environment of trusting and cooperative relationships between the state agency and institutions, the institutions can even play an active role in these forms of centralized planning. In less positive settings, often the potential of leadership being assumed at the state level results in a flurry of activity within the institutions to remove the necessity for central direction. This can itself produce a positive outcome by leading to voluntary cooperative arrangements among institutions. State agency involvement has, then, brought about decentralized planning.

These latter examples raise the possibility of a more active role on the part of the state agency leading to relationships with the institutions in which trust and cooperation are less likely. If institutions perceive constraints being imposed on their limits of freedom, a climate conducive to the kinds of behavior discussed earlier may disappear with the resulting negative implications for productive planning activities. Central agency staff must keep in mind such possible consequences when assuming a more directive role.

In summary, if a state agency is doing its job, as I define that job, it will be deliberately and successfully encouraging pervasive planning throughout the state system of higher education. Depending upon the governance pattern in the state and the specific statutory authority of the state agency, the process may be one of suggesting, persuading, cajoling, provoking, prodding, perhaps even inspiring, institutions to

undertake planning activities. This may be the most significant role for a state coordinating agency to play and may be the most important manner in which it positively impacts the future of higher education in a given state. If the agency is successful in fostering an environment of openness and minimal conflict, most planning will be left decentralized and will be carried out at the institutional level but in a manner responsive to issues identified and posed by the state agency, as well as responsive to local institutional concerns.

LGE:ss
5-9-79

PERVASIVE PLANNING AND THE USE OF MODELING SYSTEMS:
FIRST RESULTS OF TWO CASE STUDIES

Thomas W WEST

For as long as I have been in higher education administration (two decades), the need for a strategic long range plan has been valued as imperative to an institution's success and survivability. For almost as long as the use of a variety of management tools -- PPBS, MBO, MIS, and computer modeling -- have been touted as the cure-alls in making institutional decisionmaking more rational. Thank goodness for this ongoing pursuit of rationality; otherwise, many of us would be unemployed.

While each of the management tools mentioned would be fertile ground to plow today as we discuss the issue of pervasive planning, I would like to focus on the impact that modeling and models have had on the planning process in higher education.

Do you realize that we are in our second decade of using computerized models in an attempt to make decisionmaking and planning more rational for institutions. I remember a document being put out in 1959, the name escapes me now, which gave the essence of a ten-year planning model. It was based on a variety of formuli and ratios which had been articulated and agreed to by key individuals in the higher education scene. Subsequently the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) got deeply involved in developing such models as Resource Requirements Prediction Model (RRPM), Cost Estimation Model (CEM), Information Exchange Program (IEP), and others. Today, NCHEMS is still considered the leader in developing techniques and models for analysis and planning. Other efforts in the modeling of higher education include the Consortia for Financing Higher Education (COFHE), sponsored by the American Council in Education; the Institute for Management Science (TIMS), the Operations Research Society of America (ORSA), and the American Institute of Decision Sciences (AIDS). In addition, several consulting firms have been into the

business developing such models as the Comprehensive Analytical Methods for Planning in University Systems (CAMPUS), by the Systems Research Group; Higher Education Long Range Planning/Planning Translator (HELP/PlanTran), by the Midwest Research Institute; and Systems for Evaluation Alternative Research Commitments in Higher Education (SEARCH) by Pete, Marwick, and Mitchell to name a few.

As reported in a number of studies, and most recently by EDUCOM, many of these models have not met with success originally predicted. A major contributing factor for the lack of success can be attributed to the fact that most of these models demand users fit their institutions into a model which has a predetermined set of variables and relationships among those variables.

These models fail to recognize the diversity of management styles among administrators. Furthermore, the model is not adaptive, they are complex, difficult to change, and not well understood by users. Finally, information interpreters are needed to interface between the model and decisionmaker.

Some givens for good modeling systems:

- Decisionmaker is the modeler
- Simple to develop model
- Can use data elements as understood in the environment
- Accessible to manipulation - interactive
- Results communicate in English
- Others can understand model
- Adaptive to new perceptions of reality

Today, I would like to share the first results of two case studies using such a modeling system -- Management Analysis Planning Support Systems (MAPSS). I want to illustrate how such a tool can have a profound and positive impact on the planning behavior of an institution. In one case a liberal arts college and in the other a multicampus university.

CASE I - LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE

Institutional Setting

- 1000 students with dropping enrollment from 1300
- Third president in five years
- Second line officers stable old timers
- Decisionmaking has been historically centralized with president
- New president planning and team oriented
- He launches long range planning effort
- Has need for methodology and tools which will glue planning together and build confidence and accountability among second and third line administrators
- Established Planning Committee and Framework for Planning
- Introduced MAPSS as the modeling tool to assist in dealing with "what if" questions related to overall strategic issues, as well as specific tactical issues in each administrative area
- All second line and selected third line administrators are introduced and indoctrinated into use of MAPSS
- Each identified planning problem and wrote model
- Collectively the management team worked on overall institutional model. The outcome was the development of one perception of the institution's reality.
- Through the iterative process simulations were made for alternative decisions to a planning issue. Management team then added its wisdom and made decisions.

The following are examples of how the modeling system has served to glue together the planning process as a pervasive behavior at this institution:

The MACRO Model

- Enrollment is the driving force for this institution's planning. Enrollment determines income consequently what is available to spend.
- By developing a model showing interrelationships of enrollment to income and then personnel and related expenses the management team was able to get into a "what if" mode of alternative exploration.
- This model was developed between Christmas and February 1 including fine tuning.
- Between February 1 and March 1 management team used to set for budget plan for the next year. Three levels of budget were established -- optimistic, expected, and minimal. In essence, the institution was prepared to go up or down depending on its enrollment. In fact, it went up and a final plan.

Mini Models

1. Lifelong Learning Center
2. Financial Aids Forecasting
3. Recruiting Markets - Cost/Benefit Analysis
4. Development/Fund Raising Plans
5. Academic Major Tracking and Course Distribution
6. Residence Hall Space Planning
7. Food Service Planning

CASE II - MULTICAMPUS UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

Institutional Setting

- 70,000+ students with stable enrollment
- President for 8 years
- Conservative key administrative committee
- Decisionmaking highly diffused - school autonomy
- Planning long range HEC stimulated
- 3rd planning cycle since 1973. Highly manual mode. Separated from budget planning cycle
- Framework for plan well set

Use of MAPSS

- Introduced at administrative unit levels as beginning. Central budget has mechanize forecasting with high dependency on technocrats
- Currently, in use in academic school, Records and Admissions, regional campus, computing network, campus planning office, Halls of Residence, and instructional use.

The following are some examples of how the modeling system MAPSS is evolving into a tool to bring cohesiveness to planning process.

Enrollment Projections

- A sophisticated enrollment projection model has been in existence for a decade. Demands technical interface. Has caused frustration to campus decisionmakers. MAPSS model has been written (6 hours) to replicate older model. Gives each campus planner hands on.

Recruitment

- How many contacts are necessary to gain X matriculants. A two-way model has been operationalized to assist in developing recruiting strategy.

Campus Financial Plan

- A total enrollment driven resource allocation model has been piloted at one of the campuses.

Policy Issue

- Graduate Tuition and Fee Policy. Six alternatives explored for impact over time
- Faculty distribution projection for college

Computing Network Planning

- Operations five-year plan
- Computer Utility Charges to campuses

Halls of Residence

- MACRO Financial Planning
- Center Planning (Mini Model)